

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
GREENVILLE DIVISION

Hobart P. Drake,

Plaintiff,

v.

Michael Laurence, et. al.,

Defendants.

---

)  
)  
)  
)  
)  
)  
)  
)  
)  
)  
)

Case No. 6:09-cv-3105-RMG

**ORDER**

This matter is before the court upon the magistrate judge's recommendation. The record includes the report and recommendation of the United States Magistrate Judge made in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B). Because petitioner is *pro se*, this matter was referred to the magistrate judge.<sup>1</sup>

This Court is charged with conducting a *de novo* review of any portion of the magistrate judge's report to which a specific objection is registered, and may accept, reject, or modify in whole or in part, the recommendations contained in that report. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). No objections have been filed to the magistrate's report.

Absent a timely objection from a dissatisfied party, a district court is not required to review, under a *de novo* or any other standard, a Magistrate Judge's factual or legal conclusions. *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 150 (1985); *Wells v. Shriner's Hosp.*, 109 F.3d 198, 201 (4th Cir. 1997). Here, because the Petitioner did not file any specific, written objections, the Court need not conduct a *de novo* review of any portion of the report and recommendation. Accordingly, the Court hereby adopts

---

<sup>1</sup> Pursuant to the provisions of Title 28 United States Code, § 636(b)(1)(B), and Local Rule 73.02 (B)(2), D.S.C., the magistrate judge is authorized to review all pretrial matters and submit findings and recommendations to the Court.

the Magistrate Judge's R&R (Dkt. No. 51) as the Order of this Court, and it is

**ORDERED** that Defendants' motion for judgment is **GRANTED**.

**AND IT IS SO ORDERED.**

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'R. Gergel', is written over a horizontal line.

Richard Mark Gergel  
United States District Judge

October 19, 2010  
Charleston, South Carolina